DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 283 95 CE 007 303

TITLE Policy-Making for Vocational Education.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Div. of Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides; Advisory Committees; Educational Assessment; *Educational Policy; *Educational Principles; Evaluation Needs; Financial Policy; *Guidelines; Personnel Policy; *Policy Formation; Post Secondary Education; Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The report is intended as a guide for persons at the State, county, and local level who contribute to statewide policy for vocational education. Principles of vocational education are listed. Policy statements concerning program, personnel, fiscal operation, and evaluation are included in an attempt to isolate and delineate some of the factors that affect the everyday operation of vocational education at the State level. The statements are generalizable to all vocational education programs and are prescriptive only in the sense that they provide examples from which rules may be developed. The statements were formulated at a series of six conferences by high school, adult, and community college program policy makers from five States (Washington, California, Texas, Ohio, and Georgia) chosen as having a representative sampling of vocational education programs. Six persons from each State participated in the conferences. A selected 16-item bibliography is included. (Documents available from ERIC are noted with appropriate numbers.) Appended are lists of project participants, advisory committee members, and project resource people. (Author/MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

JUN 23 1976

POLICY-MAKING for VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

ED126283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OEOC78037

SUGGESTIONS: for developing and implementing policies for vocational education in the states

POLICY-MAKING

FOR

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Division of Vocational Education
University of California
November, 1975

The activities which are reported herein were supported in whole or part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare in co-operation with the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, under the Education Professions Development Act. Contractors conducting such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official U.S. Office of Education policy.

Developed pursuant to a contract with the
United States Office of Education
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education,
Vocational Education Personnel Development Program

and

The California State Department of Education

by the

Division of Vocational Education
University of California

1975

FOREWORD

One of the persistent stumbling blocks in the pathway to quality vocational education programs has been the nature of, or in many instances the lack of, policy for vocational education at the state level. Some states presently have excellent statements of policy, but many do not. This project was planned to provide assistance to all states as they review or establish basic statewide policy for vocational education.

This project was a long time in the planning stage. It would have been perfectly possible for a person with extensive expertise in vocational education to develop some reasonable statements of statewide policy. But no one individual, despite extensive experience, could really feel the pulse of the nation as to the nature of appropriate contemporary statements of policy for vocational education at the state level.

Five states were selected for participation in the project . . . Washington, California, Texas, Ohio and Georgia . . . as having a representative sampling of vocational education programs in the nation. Six persons in positions involving policy formation were invited from each of the five states to form the project participant group (Appendix A). These participants represented vocational education at all levels; high school, adult school and community college. From the over 500 years of experience and the broad backgrounds of interest of the participants, it was possible to construct a consensus representing state vocational education policy with implications for local policy needs.

The total group met five times, one conference in each of the five states, to formulate policy statements. This proved to be an exciting professional experience for the total group because it was necessary to avoid provincialism and maintain a nationwide point of view. At the five conferences, the participants reviewed and reinterpreted the principles upon which vocational education is based, and identified or developed policy statements around categories that had been identified by the project's national advisory committee (Appendix B) at a December, 1974 meeting. The opinions of the persons attending the five conferences were supplemented, reinforced, and in some cases modified, by resource people who provided background material and insight on the topic of each particular meeting.

Upon completion of the five national conferences, a summary conference was held in August, 1975, with representatives from each of the participating states, for the purposes of making a final review and accomplishing a partial editing of the report. A meeting of the advisory committee was held on the day following the summary conference. A final review was held with representatives of the U.S. Office of Education in October, 1975.

This report is intended as a guide for all persons; state, county, and local, who mold or contribute to statewide policy for vocational education. Principles which

have been restated and updated in order to serve as a basis for policies are included in the report. Policy statements concerning program, personnel, fiscal operation, and evaluation are included in an attempt to isolate and delineate some of the factors that effect the everyday operation of vocational education at the state level. The statements in this report are not operational policies, or rules and regulations, but are general statements that may be used to express the intent of society, business, industry, labor and the education hierarchy.

The Division of Vocational Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California, planned and conducted the project and the conferences that were part of the project. J. Lyman Goldsmith, retired Los Angeles City Schools Administrator, managed the project. He and his assistant arranged conference sites, schedules and activities, prepared conference materials, finalized agendas, arranged for resource services (Appendix C), handled project details, and reported project findings. Paul Bott assisted in project management and was responsible for research and writing. Clarence Fielstra, operating as an independent evaluator, evaluated all project activities and outputs. Nancy Goff, Administrative Assistant, and Judy Madson, Secretary, handled fiscal and secretarial details.

Melvin L. Barlow, Director
Division of Vocational Education
University of California

Los Angeles
November, 1975

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword iii

Introduction 1

Personnel for Whom the Report is Intended 3

Uses of the Report 3

Principles of Vocational Education 4

Program Policies 7

Personnel Policies 10

Fiscal Policies 12

Evaluation Policies 15

Selected Bibliography 18

Appendix A
Project Participants 20

Appendix B
Advisory Committee Members 23

Appendix C
Project Resource People 25

INTRODUCTION

The statements of vocational education principles and policies presented in this report must be viewed in relation to the historical background of vocational education planning and implementation in the United States. The statements of principles are not new, but are refinements and reinterpretations of statements that have previously been made. Not all of the policy statements are new, but many of them have been revised and updated.

By 1917, when implementation of the vocational movement in education began, at least eleven years of careful study had been devoted to the fundamental issues related to vocational education. Proponents of the vocational education movement had been careful to "think through" in great detail the purposes, the practices, and the ultimate goals of vocational education. This planning process had involved participation from a wide range of the American public. The list of such persons, if it could be reproduced, would represent a who's who of business, industry, agriculture, education, and the public at large. These were the men and women who believed in providing a better deal for the youth and adults who needed to improve their positions in the world of work. From the beginning, vocational education has been concerned with people and the work that they do.

The professional association which represented the interests of the growing number of people with concerns for vocational education was the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, founded in New York in 1906. (This group is now known as the American Vocational Association.) Because vocational education was of national concern, because of the mobility of labor, and because of financial limitations among the states, the Society sought federal appropriations for secondary and adult vocational education to match the Congressional action for the colleges in 1862—the Morrill Act.

A long period of study, 1906-1917, by the professional association preceded congressional action. During this period many foundation elements for vocational education were examined in detail. Members of the Society came to agreement on the basic issues that they wanted as generalizable items to be applied to all of vocational education. For example, in 1907, they came to a conclusion on the question as to whom vocational education was to be made available. Their actual statement reads as follows: "race, creed, color, sex, or national origin shall not debar anyone from vocational education."

These foundation elements were identified in the proceedings and reports of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education and were debated in annual meetings of the Society. Few areas of education have had such a thorough review before being implemented as did vocational education. The professional literature of the period, newspapers, and popular periodicals picked

up the Society's ideas for comment and review. At one period of time, circa 1912-1914, Senator Carroll S. Page estimated that his activities alone concerning vocational education had reached more than ten million people. The early activities and studies resulted in the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917.

At the beginning of the vocational education movement there were no "experts" in vocational education. The principles and practices had to be learned by each person. A philosophy (as the term is used loosely in vocational education) had to be developed. This philosophy consisted actually of an understanding of the basic principles which had been identified between 1906 and 1917. The early teachers of the philosophy, policy, and principles of vocational education were the persons who had participated in developing the foundations for the structure of vocational education.

Presently, three generations later, these early leaders are gone. Few people now active in vocational education have had the privilege of "sitting at the feet of the masters" to learn about vocational education and thus develop a sound commitment to the field—a commitment based upon foundation principles.

The enactment of the two federal vocational education acts of 1963 and 1968 has proved to be a major cause of the tremendous increase in the number of vocational programs in the last fifteen years. Yet, parts of the allocations under the federal legislation have never been used, often because there has existed no policy or system for using the funds efficiently and effectively once they were released. Too often the policies that have been adopted by states have been adopted solely for the purpose of accepting certain funds provided by the federal legislation. Policy at the state level has not been adjusted to meet the new goals set for the vocational education effort by federal legislation, industry, and society.

To achieve the national goals of vocational education, wise planning and vigorous action is required of people in leadership positions. Educational decision-makers must be directly involved in the development of policy that will govern the nation's schools if national goals are to be met.

One of the major purposes of this project was to review and reinterpret some of the early principles of vocational education and then suggest optimum policy statements for use in four basic areas—program, personnel, finance, and evaluation. The project was an attempt to develop ways and means to increase the impact of vocational education funds by encouraging the highest level of decision-makers from five states to be participants in a leadership program that had as an aim the development of policy for vocational education that is based on sound social, philosophical, and economic principles.

When "vocational education" is referred to in this report, it should be understood that "quality vocational education" is meant. Quality vocational education has such components as:

(1) a qualified, competent staff;

(2) meaningful, effective, up-to-date curricula offerings;

(3) placement assistance for individuals who have received instruction;

(4) supportive community and business-industry elements; and

(5) built-in self adjusting mechanisms that anticipate or react to the demands of the labor market and society.

The policy statements contained in this report are generalizable to all vocational education and are prescriptive only in the sense that they provide examples from which rules may be developed. Administrative prescriptive rules, if they are needed at all, should be developed on the basis of general policy statements. The policy statements in this report have not been given any order of priority.

For Whom is This Report Intended?

This report is intended primarily for policy-makers at the state level; such as persons in education and areas of state government who occupy a decision-making role related to vocational education, or those who are in a position to influence policy at the state level. Included as policy-makers are members of state boards of education, state vocational education advisory committees, state boards of vocational education, and other state boards that have official functions related to vocational education. In addition, the report is intended for any person (state, county, and local) whose actions and pronouncements mold or contribute to statewide policy for vocational education.

How Can This Report be Used?

States vary widely in the extent to which they have developed viable, up-to-date policy for vocational education. While some states do have excellent policy statements, others do not. This report can be used by all states to review their own policy statements about vocational education, and to update, extend, or modify such policy statements. States can make an issue of having sound policy—policy that can be generalizable to all vocational education programs, and policy that is not prescriptive. States can review their "rules and regulations" for vocational education—the prescription for vocational education in a state—and can test or match the prescription against their policy. States may wish to incorporate their policy related to vocational principles in their state education codes, thereby declaring that policy to be that of the people of the states.

PRINCIPLES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

To be effective, a policy must be based upon an underlying belief or assumption. Principles are basic truths, laws, or assumptions which determine the intrinsic nature or behavior of vocational education. Principles serve as the basis for policy and are inextricably bound to the economy, the labor force, and the social structure. The majority of the principles that guide vocational education today were first delineated during the period 1906 through 1917, and have been periodically reinterpreted to reflect changes in society, business, industry, and education. Principles that were first expressed as beliefs or theories, have since 1917 been verified and are now considered as standards or basic truths.

The principles contained in this report are based on beliefs as to what is or should be true in vocational education. Each statement is presented as if it actually is true, even though in some cases this ideal may not yet be reached.

The principles that are listed in this report are of a broad philosophical nature and are not intended as operational guidelines or rules and regulations.

Individual states may wish to use the principles contained in this section as the basis for broad general policies and then translate those policies into operational policies and rules and regulations.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BENEFITS AND IS THE SHARED RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NATION, THE STATE AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION REQUIRES A COMPETENT STAFF WITH EXPERTISE IN THE FIELDS FOR WHICH THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS DEVELOPED, CONDUCTED, AND EVALUATED IN CONSULTATION WITH APPROPRIATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS BASED UPON A SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND EMPLOYMENT NEEDS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION REFLECTS AND ANTICIPATES THE CHANGING ATTITUDES AND VALUES OF SOCIETY AS WELL AS THE CHANGING REQUIREMENTS OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BENEFITS INDIVIDUALS IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC NECESSITY, PERSONAL SATISFACTION AND COMPETENCE ON THE JOB.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROVIDES OPTIONS THAT WILL BENEFIT INDIVIDUALS ENTERING, UPGRADING OR RETRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROVIDES FOR THE UNIQUE NEEDS, EXPERIENCES, AND VARYING ABILITIES OF INDIVIDUALS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS OF DIRECT VALUE TO SOCIETY IN RELATION TO THE STABILITY OF THE ECONOMY AND THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF THE LABOR FORCE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS TO DISCOVER AND DEVELOP THEIR VOCATIONAL INTERESTS AND ABILITIES AND TO BE ASSISTED TOWARD PLACEMENT IN THE OCCUPATION FOR WHICH THEY HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTION.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DEVELOPS WORK ATTITUDES, SALEABLE SKILLS, AND USABLE KNOWLEDGE RELATED TO EMPLOYMENT.

- FLEXIBLE ENTRY AND EXIT FOR INDIVIDUALS IS A CHARACTERISTIC OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS APPROPRIATE FOR ALL INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT REGARD TO SEX, CREED, RELIGION, RACE, GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HANDICAPS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS AN IDENTIFIABLE INTEGRAL COMPONENT OF QUALITY COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CONTRIBUTES TO THE CONCEPT THAT AN INDIVIDUAL'S OCCUPATION IS A MAJOR COHESIVE FORCE IN THE CONTINUITY OF THAT INDIVIDUAL'S LIFE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LEARNING IS MORE EFFECTIVE WHEN IT OCCURS IN A CONTEXT THAT EITHER IS OR SIMULATES AN ACTUAL JOB SITUATION.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS CONCERNED WITH THE TOTAL GROWTH OF INDIVIDUALS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS FOR THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO NEED IT, WANT IT, AND ARE ABLE TO PROFIT BY IT.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS HELD ACCOUNTABLE AND IS EVALUATED ON THE BASIS OF OBJECTIVES, PROCESSES, PRODUCTS, COSTS AND COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS COORDINATED AMONG THE VARIOUS AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS SO AS TO MAXIMIZE AVAILABLE RESOURCES.

PROGRAM POLICIES

The total vocational education program consists of the courses, sequence of courses, or groups of courses that comprise the total offerings in vocational education. The program could be as broad as the occupational structure itself except that federal legislation under the title of "vocational education" does not include occupations that are classified as *professional* or that require a *baccalaureate or higher degree.*

The vocational education program is intended to be closely related to the occupations or jobs that employ most of the people. In this sense the program is sensitive to employment and can be expected to change as employment demands fluctuate or change. As new occupations and jobs are developed that create an employment market, vocational education is expected to adapt its program to include these new employment areas. Similarly, as old occupations cease to provide an employment market, vocational education is expected to reject such preparation as a part of its program.

An apparent conflict of principles frequently appears when an enrollment demand exists, but an employment demand does not exist. Denying individuals the right to instruction they desire—the freedom of choice concept—appears to be inconsistent when one applies the employment potential concept. The freedom of choice concept is modified in vocational education theory by an additional phrase—"must be able to profit from the instruction." Since an ultimate aim of vocational education is to educate people so that they might be placed in a job, "profit" is often interpreted to have a "monetary" value rather than a "personal" value overtone. So, in a sense, complete freedom in program development is modified by employment opportunities.

The vocational education program is also influenced by the "availability" concept in vocational education. It is incumbent upon the states to study carefully the availability concept and to make it possible for vocational education instruction to be "available" to all. Extremes in the application of the availability concept appear at times to have impossible, or impractical solutions.

The policy statements in this section address the extent and scope of vocational programs, the people to be served, and criteria for use in program planning. In many instances, these statements could be directly incorporated into state education codes, while in other cases they might require some modification in order to fit state education patterns.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE EXTENT THAT ALL INDIVIDUALS LEAVING OR GRADUATING FROM EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS WILL HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN A SALEABLE SKILL.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL PROVIDE FOR A REALISTIC BALANCE BETWEEN THE VOCATIONAL INTERESTS OF INDIVIDUALS AND THE NEEDS OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, AND SOCIETY.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL INCLUDE INSTRUCTION IN READING, ORAL AND WRITTEN EXPRESSION, COMPUTATION, AND SOCIAL INTERACTION AS THEY ARE REQUIRED BY THE OCCUPATIONS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL PROVIDE OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO SERVE ALL INDIVIDUALS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL AGE OR OLDER, INCLUDING THOSE WHO HAVE ACADEMIC, SOCIOECONOMIC, CULTURAL, PHYSICAL OR OTHER HANDICAPS, AND WHO NEED OR CAN PROFIT FROM THE INSTRUCTION.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE DESIGNED (1) TO PREPARE OR RETRAIN YOUTH AND ADULTS FOR EMPLOYMENT OR FOR ADVANCEMENT IN RECOGNIZED AND NEW AND EMERGING OCCUPATIONS; OR (2) TO PREPARE INDIVIDUALS FOR ENROLLMENT IN ADVANCED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS TO ENABLE THEM TO BE PREPARED FOR, RETRAINED, OR UPGRADED IN RECOGNIZED AND NEW AND EMERGING OCCUPATIONS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE PROVIDED THAT ALLOW INDIVIDUALS THE OPPORTUNITY TO ENTER, PROGRESS, AND EXIT AS THEIR SPECIFIC NEEDS DICTATE.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE DEVELOPED AND PERIODICALLY REVISED TO REFLECT SOCIETAL, ECONOMIC, AND OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION THAT IS REALISTIC IN TERMS OF ACTUAL OR ANTICIPATED OCCUPATIONAL REQUIREMENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO ALL INDIVIDUALS WHO NEED IT AND ARE ABLE TO PROFIT FROM IT.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE DEVELOPED WITH INPUT FROM SUCH AGENCIES AS LABOR, EMPLOYMENT OR MANPOWER, COMMUNITY, AND EMPLOYER GROUPS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE DEVELOPED IN CONSIDERATION OF NATIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL LABOR MARKET FORECASTS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM OFFERINGS SHALL BE DETERMINED ON THE BASIS OF IDENTIFIABLE NEEDS, OCCUPATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS, EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS, AND CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL SURVEYS.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, OPERATING, AND EVALUATING, SHALL BE APPROPRIATELY ARTICULATED AMONG ALL AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES WITHIN THE STATE SHALL STRUCTURE INFORMATION SYSTEMS WHICH SHALL INCLUDE COMMON DATA ELEMENTS TO AID IN PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS.

PERSONNEL POLICIES

An effective comprehensive vocational education program can only be implemented and made operationally functional today with a qualified and competent staff of teachers, supervisors and administrators.

Federal legislation has not addressed the personnel problem in vocational education since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. In the past, primary concern was based on the teacher and teacher competence. Vocational personnel thought to be competent at the time they were hired were assumed to be competent forever. To some degree, in this same period of time, state-level policies have been directed toward those who plan, organize and administer vocational education programs rather than those who teach. A new look at state-level policies for vocational education personnel is needed.

Vocational teachers supply learning experiences in the applied, theoretical, and socio-cultural domains and serve as models by virtue of their competence and behavior. Vocational education supervisors and administrators must know and use occupational subject area content, management methods and techniques, and interpersonal relations. Vocational teacher educators must use up-dated teaching techniques and serve as models for vocational teachers.

These statements are related to statewide personnel policies and are limited to personnel identified as instructors, coordinators, supervisors, directors, teacher educators, or other similar titles for personnel in vocational education. This section does *not* include statements related to students. States may wish to add policies for students to complete their policy statements.

- ALL INSTRUCTIONAL, SUPERVISORY, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND TEACHER EDUCATION PERSONNEL IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS SHALL MEET MINIMUM PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS WHICH ARE SET AND PERIODICALLY REVIEWED AND UPDATED BY AN APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCY.

- ALL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL (INSTRUCTIONAL, SUPERVISORY, ADMINISTRATIVE AND TEACHER TRAINING) SHALL:

  (A) BE COMPETENT VOCATIONAL TEACHERS;

  (B) BE OCCUPATIONALLY PROFICIENT IN THEIR FIELD OF INSTRUCTION OR SUPERVISION; AND

  (C) POSSESS ACTUAL WORK EXPERIENCE BEYOND THE LEARNING PERIOD IN THEIR FIELD OF INSTRUCTION OR SUPERVISION.

- THE STATE SHALL SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE EDUCATION IN THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR PERSONS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN GENERAL EDUCATION.

- THE STATE SHALL MAINTAIN ADEQUATE PROGRAMS OF PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL, SUPERVISORY, ADMINISTRATIVE, TEACHER TRAINING, AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL.

- THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCIES AND THE MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS SHALL BE THE SHARED RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL, THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY, THE STATE AND THE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS.

- APPROPRIATE CONSIDERATION IN THE FORM OF SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS SHALL BE GIVEN TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL BASED ON THEIR DEMONSTRATED OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE AS WELL AS PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND YEARS OF SERVICE.

- PERIODIC EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL SHALL BE CONDUCTED BY THE EMPLOYING STATE OR LOCAL AGENCY OR INSTITUTION.

- RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, EMPLOYMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH CURRENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICIES.

- THE STATE SHALL REQUIRE ALL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL, INCLUDING TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND TEACHER EDUCATORS, TO HAVE INDIVIDUALIZED PLANS OF PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THAT WILL BE REVISED AS NEEDED.

- THE STATE SHALL PROVIDE ADEQUATE PROGRAM AND SUPPORT SERVICES FOR ORIENTING NEW PERSONNEL AT ALL LEVELS OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEM.

FISCAL POLICIES

The fiscal policies for vocational education at the state level proposed in this section involve much more than the development of statements concerning the expenditure of federal funds, although state policy must include items dealing with that issue. State policies regarding the financing of vocational education must relate to the total expenditures of funds for vocational education so that such funds are managed and spent wisely. It is in this sense that financial policy must be generated at the state level for the financing of vocational education in total.

The national program of vocational education was created as a general partnership between the federal government and the states. Federal funding of vocational education became necessary because the states could not financially support the program in its entirety. In 1917, the federal portion of the funds spent for vocational education was quite significant in relationship to the total amount. The original law for vocational education specified that the partnership be of the nature that each federal dollar be matched by state or local dollars, or both. The original concept still applies in vocational education, but in the years since 1917 the program has grown in size and expanded in offerings so that nearly 14 million students are now enrolled. The ratio between federal, state and local funding has changed significantly. The total cost of vocational education in the nation, combining federal, state, and local funds, amounts to $3.5 billion to $4.0 billion. Only about $600 million of this total national expenditure for vocational education is federal funds.

It was never intended that federal funding of vocational education should pay the total costs of vocational education. Although at the beginning of the vocational education movement the amount of federal funding approximated 50 percent of the total expenditures, that percentage has decreased considerably in the years that followed to approximately 15 percent. The total funding of vocational education is deemed now, as it always has been, a combination of funds from the federal government, the state governments, and the local governments.

The bulk of the funding for vocational education must of necessity come from the state and local governments. Just what part is borne by state funds and by federal funds varies among the states. Some states contribute significant amounts toward vocational education over and beyond the funding that is provided for all persons in school, while some states do not provide an adequate funding arrangement at the state level to conduct the vocational education program.

The statements in this section serve as guidelines for the states in examining their funding policy for vocational education and in generating appropriate state policy.

- ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT (NATIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL) SHALL CO-OPERATE IN FINANCING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

- FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS SHALL BE USED TO SUPPLEMENT STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS IN SUCH AREAS AS: (1) PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING TEACHER TRAINING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT; (2) PROGRAM START-UP COSTS; (3) SPECIAL TRAINING NEEDS; (4) EQUIPMENT ACQUISITION AND REPLACEMENT; (5) CONSTRUCTION; (6) RESEARCH; AND (7) CURRICULUM MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT.

- STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR BASIC VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COSTS AND FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

- FUNDING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE BASED ON A PLANNING SYSTEM WHICH IDENTIFIES AND THEN ELIMINATES OR AVOIDS UNNECESSARY PROGRAM DUPLICATION.

- THE ALLOCATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES SHALL CONSIDER SUCH FACTORS AS: IDENTIFIED NEEDS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE POPULATION WITHIN THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DISTRICT, SPECIFIC LOCAL PLANS TO MEET THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS, THE COMPATABILITY OF SUCH PLANS WITH LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES, CURRENT AND PROJECTED LABOR MARKET NEEDS, AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES AT THE NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LEVELS.

- THE STATE, WHEN ESTABLISHING RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE RESIDUAL OR EXCESS COSTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, SHALL CONSIDER SUCH FACTORS AS THE SOCIOECONOMIC LEVEL OF THE POPULATION TO BE SERVED AND THE TAX BASE OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

- THE CONTINUED DISBURSEMENT OF STATE AND FEDERAL VOCATIONAL FUNDS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES SHALL BE BASED ON THE ABILITY OF THE VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE SPECIFIED, MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES.

- THERE SHALL BE A SINGLE PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE AND ONE AGENCY FOR RECEIPT AND DISBURSEMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDS, ALTHOUGH MORE THAN ONE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY MAY HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTERING PARTS OF THE PLAN.

- THE STATE SHALL ALLOCATE FUNDS FOR CONDUCTING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS.

- ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS SHALL BE DEVELOPED AND USED THAT ARE DESIGNED TO CLEARLY IDENTIFY RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND BALANCES OF THE SEVERAL FUNDS USED TO FINANCE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

- THE STATE SHALL ADVISE AND INFORM ALL LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE RESOURCES AND SERVICES AVAILABLE FOR PROGRAMMING, PLANNING AND BUDGETING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.

- THE STATE SHALL ESTABLISH STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR THE DISBURSEMENT OF STATE AND FEDERAL MONIES TO MAINTAIN AND EXPAND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

- SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH ARE FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO PROVIDE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT, OR WHICH HAVE FEWER THAN THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF STUDENTS TO MAINTAIN A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, SHALL ENTER INTO CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS WITH APPROVED EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE INSTRUCTION NEEDED.

EVALUATION POLICIES

It has been repeatedly recommended by curriculum and vocational education practitioners that an evaluation process be an integral part of the vocational education system in order to assure quality control. Evaluation, as an integral part of the instructional system, involves the students, instructors, administrators, advisory groups, and employers, and usually incorporates student follow-up studies. Evaluation reports typically provide statistical and verbal data that are used in the decision-making process.

Evaluation of students in terms of stated performance objectives must be an inherent part of the vocational program if the instructor is to know whether the students are ready for employment or advanced training at the end of the course or program. The results of student evaluations may serve as the basis for upgrading the quality of instruction, or for modifying the original course or program objectives.

Evaluation of vocational education personnel in terms of their qualifications and competencies is also needed in order to maintain a quality delivery system. Personnel evaluation may consist of self-evaluation, peer evaluation, or evaluation by persons external to the system.

The maintenance of a quality control system for vocational education requires evaluation of the goals, processes, and products of the vocational instruction. Quality assurance implies an interrelationship of the curriculum itself, the instruction and administration of the program, and the evaluation of the goals, processes, and products of the vocational education system. Curriculum, instruction, and evaluation are inseparable elements of the vocational education system. The statements related to evaluation of vocational education address the necessity of maintaining that interrelationship.

- EVALUATION SHALL BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE STATE'S VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEM, AND THE APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCY, THROUGH THE STATE PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, SHALL MAKE PROVISIONS FOR PERIODIC AND CONTINUOUS EVALUATION PROCEDURES AT BOTH STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAM LEVELS.

- THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES GENERATED BY THE PLANNING PROCESS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED BY GROUPS BOTH EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL TO THE FORMAL EDUCATION PROCESS.

- THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION EVALUATION PROCESS SHALL INVOLVE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS, COUNSELORS, AND OTHER SUPPORT STAFF.

- THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION EVALUATION PROCESS SHALL INVOLVE PERSONS EXTERNAL TO THE FORMAL EDUCATIONAL PROCESS INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, LABOR AND MANAGEMENT.

- THE STATE, IN COOPERATION WITH THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND OTHER GROUPS, SHALL EVALUATE THE STATEWIDE ANNUAL AND LONG-RANGE VOCATIONAL PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.

- EVALUATION ACTIVITIES SHALL BE ESTABLISHED AND CONDUCTED AT PREDETERMINED INTERVALS IN THE PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATION PHASES OF THE VARIOUS STATE AND LOCAL VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

- THE ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF QUANTIFIABLE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES DESCRIBING DESIRED OUTCOMES SHALL BE USED AS A BASIS FOR STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING.

- EVALUATION OF STATE INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR AND CONDUCTED BY THE APPROPRIATE STATE AGENCY, AND THE REPORTS OF SUCH EVALUATION STUDIES SHALL SERVE AS A BASIS FOR THE PLANNING AND REVISION OF SUCH PROGRAMS.

- THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING PROCESS SHALL BE DOCUMENTED IN SUCH A FORMAT THAT THE TECHNIQUES AND THE CONTENT OF THE PLANNING PROCESS MAY BE EVALUATED AND USED IN FUTURE PLANNING.

- THE STATE AND LOCAL PLANS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHALL BE PERIODICALLY REVIEWED BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS AND OTHER GROUPS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS.

- EVALUATION SYSTEMS OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES SHALL BE COORDINATED TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.

- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE EVALUATED ON THE BASIS OF SUCH CRITERIA AS THE DEGREE TO WHICH STATED OBJECTIVES ARE MET, THE PROCESSES THAT ARE USED TO MEET THE OBJECTIVES, THE COSTS OF THE PROGRAMS, AND THE DEGREE OF COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROGRAMS.

- THE DATA THAT ARE USED FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING PURPOSES SHALL BE PERIODICALLY REVIEWED, REVISED, AND UPDATED BY GROUPS THAT INCLUDE REPRESENTATIVES FROM EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT, LABOR, MANAGEMENT, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

- THE SYSTEM OF EVALUATION SHALL PROVIDE FOR FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION ON INDIVIDUALS LEAVING OR GRADUATING FROM VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

- ALL STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES SHALL AGREE UPON AND UTILIZE COMMON ITEMS OF EVALUATION INFORMATION USEFUL TO DECISION-MAKERS.

- ALL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION EVALUATION REPORTS SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO APPROPRIATE GROUPS AND AGENCIES.

- EVALUATION REPORTS SHALL BE WRITTEN USING TERMINOLOGY AND LANGUAGE THAT IS UNDERSTANDABLE BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The "ED" number in parentheses following some citations refers to the ERIC Document call number of the cited item. The ERIC Documents are available on microfiche or in paper copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Bright, R. Louis and Gideonse, Hendrik D. *Education Research and Its Relation to Policy, an Analysis Based on the Experience of the United States.* October, 1967, 67 p. (ED 018866).

Campbell, Roald F., *et al. Policy Making for American Public Schools.* Recommendations based upon working papers prepared by the committee on educational policy. 1969, 36 p. (ED 041385).

Comprehensive Vocational Education Personnel Development and Utilization. 1972, 301 p. (ED 070896).

Division of Vocational Education, University of California. *A Guide for the Development of Curriculum in Vocational and Technical Education.* Los Angeles: Division of Vocational Education, University of California, 1969, 39 p. (ED 037535).

Dror, Yehezkel. *Urban Metapolicy and Urban Education.* February, 1970, 25 p. (ED 051343).

Grubb, W. Norton and Lazerson, Marvin. "Vocational Education in American Schooling: Historical Perspectives," *Inequality in Education.* 16, March, 1974, 5-18.

Hu, Teh-Wei, *et al. A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education. Final Report.* October, 1968, 317 p. (ED 029093).

Lawrence, John E. and Dane, J. K. (Eds). *State Vocational Education Planning: An Assessment of Issues and Problems.* 1974, 115 p. (ED 092743).

Lecht, Leonard A., *et al. Relating Manpower and Demographic Information to Planning Vocational-Technical Education. Final Report.* September, 1970, 97 p. (ED 044528).

Lindman, Erick L. *Financing Vocational Education in the Public Schools.* 1970, 240 p. (ED 052517).

Mann, Dale. *Policy Decision-Making in Education.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1975, 210 p.

Miller, Melvin D. *Review and Synthesis of Research on Preparation of Leadership Personnel for Vocational and Technical Education.* July, 1972, 48 p. (ED 064471).

Norton, Robert E., *et al. Institute for Improving Vocational Education Evaluation. Final Report.* July, 1970, 282 p. (ED 045839).

Occupational Education in the Great Cities: A Statement of Position and Critical Concerns. 1968, 15 p. (ED 023905).

Rice, Dick C. *Professional Personnel in State Divisions of Vocational Education: Policies, Practices, Requirements.* November, 1968, 100 p. (ED 023928).

Wray, Ralph D. "Evaluation of Occupational Programs," *Business Education Forum.* 28(7), April, 1974, 21-22.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

William Anderson, Specialist
Program Development
California Community College Board
Sacramento, CA 95814

L. V. Ballard, Director
Public School Occupational Programs
Texas Educational Agency
Austin, TX 78701

Ray Barber, Director
Occupational Research & Development
Texas Educational Agency
Austin, TX 78701

H. R. "Bill" Cheshire, Task Force Head
Career & Vocational Education
Georgia Southern College
Statesboro, GA 30458

Dennis Coplen, Executive Director
Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Olympia, WA 98504

Ron Detrick, Director
Career Education
San Diego Unified School District
San Diego, CA 92103

*William Gordon, Dean
Program Operation
California Community College Board
Sacramento, CA 95814

J. A. Harris, Director
Pickins County Area Vocational Technical School
Jasper, GA 30143

*James W. Haynie, Assistant Director
Post Secondary Division
Texas Educational Agency
Austin, TX 78701

Donald Healas, Director
Technical-Vocational Education
Cleveland City Schools
Cleveland, OH 44114

Nancy L. Johnson, Supervisor
Vocational Education
Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Olympia, WA 98504

Leonard Kingsley, Superintendent
Penta County Joint Vocational School
Perrysburg, OH 43551

*George C. Kosbab, Assistant Director
Division of Vocational Education
Ohio State Department of Education
Columbus, OH 43215

Jack Michie, Dean
Vocational Education
Long Beach Community College
Long Beach, CA 90806

*Richard G. Moe, Assistant Director
Vocational Education
State Board for Community College Education
Olympia, WA 98504

*George Mulling, Director
Division of Planning & Development
Office of Adult & Vocational Education
Atlanta, GA 30334

Joe B. Neely, Deputy Associate Commissioner
Occupational Education & Technology
Texas Educational Agency
Austin, TX 78701

Frank Price, Associate Director
State Board for Community College Education
Olympia, WA 98504

Jerry Purser, Director
Vocational Education
Clarke County School District
Athens, GA 30601

Martin Stahl, Superintendent
Southwestern City School District
Grove City, OH 43123

W. Asbury Stembridge, Director
1202 Commission
Macon, GA 31204

*Sheila C. Tesar, Assistant Director
Community College Programs
Program Development Division
Texas Colleges and Universities
Austin, TX 78711

*Franklin B. Walter
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
Columbus, OH 43215

Yardy T. Williams, Coordinator
Vocational-Technical Education
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia
Atlanta, GA 30334

*Frank Wimer, Deputy Vocational Education Director
Coordinating Council for Occupational Education
Olympia, WA 38504

*Participants who served on the August, 1975, project summary committee.

APPENDIX B

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Lloyd Briggs
School of Occupational and Adult Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

John Bunten, Senior Program Officer
Vocational and Technical Education
DHEW-Regional Office IX
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mary Ellis
Technical Education Research Center
Washington, D.C. 20037

Alton Ice, Executive Secretary
Texas Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Austin, TX 78781

Bryant Lane, Director
Career and Occupational Preparation
San Francisco City Schools
San Francisco, CA 94102

Leon Lessinger, Dean
School of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

William Loomis, Director
Community College Programs
Oregon State Department of Education
Salem, OR 97310

James D. McComas, Dean
School of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37616

James L. Reid, Executive Director
National Association of State Directors
of Vocational Education
Catansville, MD 21228

Leonard Rosenberg, Chairman of the Board
Chesapeake Life Insurance Company
Baltimore, MD 21202

Byrl L. Shoemaker
Ohio State Director of Vocational Education
Columbus, OH 43215

Robert Taylor, Executive Director
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43221

John W. Thiele
National Advisory Council for Vocational Education
Washington, D.C. 20004

Thomas Walsh
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20006

APPENDIX C

PROJECT RESOURCE PEOPLE

George Brain
Dean, School of Education
Washington State University

Paul Briggs
Superintendent of Schools
Cleveland Public Schools

George Busbee, Governor
State of Georgia

Abram Friedman
Assistant Superintendent
Los Angeles Unified School District

Alton Ice
Executive Secretary
Texas Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Leon Lessinger
Dean, School of Education
University of South Carolina

Erick Lindman
Professor of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

William Lucas
Assistant Superintendent
Los Angeles Unified School District

Jack Nix
State Superintendent of Schools
Georgia State Department of Education

Robert Sartin
Supervisor, Industrial Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Byrl Shoemaker
Director of Vocational Education
Ohio State Department of Education

Arthur Smith
Director, Regional Occupational Program
San Bernardino (Calif.) County Schools

Merle Strong
Professor of Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin

Grant Venn
Callaway Professor of Education
Georgia State University

Robert White
Educational Liaison
Los Angeles County, AFL-CIO